Historic District Review Committee

Staff Report
September 14, 2009

Action Item

CAPP 2009-0013 Hughes Residence: Main Block and Log Addition Renovations and Rear Frame Addition Demolition in the Bluemont Historic District. MCPI 648-19-6155.

Background

The subject property located at 33697 Snickersville Turnpike in the Village of Bluemont is known as the Osburn-Scott House. This vernacular dwelling with Victorian details dates to the mid-nineteenth century and has a late nineteenth century addition that expanded the main block on the west side. The main block of the house is a two story, side gable, frame building clad with aluminum siding. It has a stone foundation and a standing seam metal roof. The original windows are 6/6 double hung sashes and the addition windows are 2/2. A bracketed porch extends the full width of the façade. The portion of the porch in front of the addition was extended circa 2007 and approved under CAPP 2006-0023. The residence has two front entrances each with a different door. Two exterior brick chimneys rise along the east end of the building and two interior brick chimneys project from the west end.

Two additions have been constructed on the rear of the building, one log and one frame. The two-story log addition has been in use as part of the residence in the recent past. The south (rear) and east (side) elevations are clad with board-and-batten siding. The logs are exposed on the west elevation. The second is a one-room frame addition attached to the rear of the log section. It is clad with board and batten siding and has a dilapidated, possibly dry laid, stone foundation and standing seam metal roof.

According to a conversation between the owners and a former resident who lived in the house in the 1930s, both the log and frame additions were constructed circa 1900. The applicant notes that the way the log addition bisects a window in the main block confirms that the log structure was built after the main block. This information seems to be corroborated in the local history, *From Snickersville to Bluemont.* First, a photo from 1907 shows both additions. The local history also notes that two neighboring buildings, “a small house…where James Murphy (a shoemaker) lived” until his death in 1856 and the “little building” that served as Dr. George E. Plaster’s office were moved and are now additions to the Osburn-Scott House. The book identifies the Osburn-Scott House as a store operated by Tarleton and Townsend Osburn in the mid-nineteenth century and later by Jonah (father) and/or Volney (son) Purcell. It also notes that in 1897, Rose Gibson bought the property and “built on this land a large boarding house, probably

using either the old office of Dr. Plaster's or the Murph[e]y house as the kitchen ell."[1] Construction of the large boarding house may coincide with the late-nineteenth century construction date for the main block expansion.

The applicant proposes several exterior changes to the main block, log addition, and frame addition:

Main Block

1. Replace in kind standing seam metal roof on main block and porch.
2. Remove gable dormer and replace with shed dormer in south (rear) roof.
3. Remove two brackets and install one wood shutter on façade.
4. Replace western front door in façade.
5. Replace and enlarge two windows and replace modern door with window in south (rear) elevation.
6. Replace window in south (rear) elevation.
7. Replace door in west (side) elevation with window.
8. Replace and enlarge one set of French doors and install a second set of French doors in south (rear) elevation.
9. Replace K-style gutters and downspouts in kind.
10. Install iron railing on east end of front porch to meet building code.
11. Repair rear deck and replace wood balustrade with one that meets building code.
12. Replace diamond lattice beneath deck with square lattice.
13. Extend rear entry porch and replace wood balustrade with one that meets building code.

Log Addition

1. Remove board and batten siding from east and south elevations of rear log addition.
2. Re-chink log addition.
3. Replace roof framing and standing seam metal roof as necessary.
4. Replace existing windows and frames.
5. Add windows to east (side) and south (rear) elevations of log addition.
6. Infill second story door.
7. Expand double door and install French door in east (side) elevation.
8. Install wood fascias and *boxed wood* soffit.
9. Install half round gutters and downspouts.

Frame Addition

1. Demolish frame addition attached to rear of log addition.

According to the Zoning Administration Referral dated September 3, 2009, there are no zoning issues with this application.

[1] Smith, Jean Herron, Evelyn Porterfield Johnson, Robert Hoffman. 2003. *From Snickersville to Bluemont: The Biography and History of a Virginia Village*. Bluemont, VA: Bluemont Citizen's Association, Pg. 63, 68, 85-6, 122, 126-27, 180.

Analysis

The Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines: Aldie, Bluemont, Oatlands, and Taylorstown Historic District (ABOT Guidelines) apply to this application. The changes proposed by the applicant will be addressed in the order listed in the Background.

Main Block

1. Replace Roof In Kind

The applicant proposes to replace the green standing seam metal roof on the main block and front porch with a patina standing seam metal roof manufactured by Follansbee. The snowbirds will also be replaced in kind. The applicant states that the roof panels will be smooth and measure 17" with 1" high seams. **Staff notes that traditional standing seam metal roofs, the predominant roof type in Loudoun County, were made on site of 17" wide smooth panels with 1½" high sides, thus the proposed replacement meets the Guidelines** (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Roof Forms and Materials, text, pg. 90 and 92; Guideline 4, pg. 93*). Staff notes that the Guidelines also support retaining as much of the original roof as possible since the applicant has stated that some contractors are recommending patching, rather than replacing the roof (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Roof Forms and Materials, Guidelines 1 and 5, pg. 93*).

The ABOT Guidelines also address sustainability and recommend considering use of reflective materials for roofs to minimize heat gain (*ABOT Guidelines, Historic Districts and the Preservation Process: Green Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts, Guideline iv, pg. 21*). Patina has one of the highest solar reflectance scores, 0.51 on a scale of 0 to 1, of Follansbee's roof colors. The higher the number, the more heat the color reflects away from an object. Only white and beige colors surpass patina.

2. Remove Rear Gable Dormer and Replace with Shed Dormer

The applicant proposes to remove the central gable dormer on the rear of the house and replace it with a larger shed roof dormer shifted slightly (approximately 3') to the west. The new dormer will provide clearance for the stairs leading to the attic living space. Currently, users have to duck to go up the steps and into the attic. The dormer roof will have a 12/2 slope and will begin just below the roof peak. A triple window will be installed in the dormer.

The ABOT Guidelines recommend retaining architectural features, including dormers. They also recommend against adding dormers if they are not part of the original design. However, dormers in historic buildings allow the attic story to become livable space by providing ventilation, light, and space (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Roof Forms and Materials, Guideline 3, pg. 93; Roof Features, text, pg. 94 and Inappropriate Treatment 1, pg. 95*). The ABOT Guidelines also suggest that dormers be scaled proportionately to the building and the roof masses and that the roof pitch match the pitch of the main roof (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Roof Features, Guidelines 2 and 3, p. 67*).

The removal of the existing dormer and addition of the shed dormer will make the attic space accessible and will increase light and ventilation in the space. The proposed dormer will be added to the rear of the building and will not be visible from the public way. The scale of the dormer is consistent with the massive rectangular roof and references the center hall division internal to the house. It would be impossible to match the slope of a shed roof dormer with the slope of the roof because of the need for headroom. Nonetheless, shed dormers are typically less steep than the associated room; therefore, this solution of similar slopes is acceptable.

Materials for the dormer are consistent with the main block. The roof of the dormer will be the same as the proposed new roof. The siding will be smooth, cedar lap siding with a 6" reveal.[2] The corner trim will be 5/4" by 4" wood trim and the gutter fascia 1" by 6" wood trim. All wood will be primed and painted white. The soffits will be primed and painted MDO (Medium Density Overlay) plywood with 2" diameter vents. MDO is traditional plywood with a resin treated fiber overlay on both faces that provides a smooth, paintable surface and is often referred to as sign board. Soffit ventilation is recommended in the Guidelines to protect against moisture buildup (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Additions: Materials and Details, Guidelines 1 and 2, pg. 88; Guidelines for Existing Structures: Cornices, Overhangs, and Parapets, Guideline 5, pg. 101*).

The triple window will be 6/6 double hung wood windows with a 7/8" Performance Divided Light as manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe. They will be the same size as the existing dormer windows and have the same muntin width. The window trim will be 5/4" by 4" painted wood trim. The proposed windows and surrounds meet the Guidelines for windows since the design and dimension of the trim, original sash, pane configuration, detailing, and materials are similar. Nonetheless, staff recommends that the window sash from the existing dormer be incorporated elsewhere in the house. It could be used as one of the three windows in the new shed dormer. The window also appears to be the same dimensions as the windows in the log addition and could be used as one of the proposed windows. Reusing original windows, particularly consolidating them in the primary façade, is recommended in the Guidelines (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Windows, Inappropriate Treatment 6, pg. 109; Guidelines 1, 7, and 10, pgs. 110-11*).

Staff finds that the proposed change to the rear dormer meets the ABOT Guidelines and is an acceptable alteration.

3. Remove Brackets and Install Shutter

Due to the narrow space between the western second story window and the end of the building, there is not enough room for both the paired brackets adorning the cornice and a shutter. The applicant proposes to remove one of these paired brackets and to hang a shutter on the western window. The applicant also proposes to remove one of the

[2] The applicant plans to remove the aluminum siding cladding the main block and repair or replace the clapboard siding beneath at a later date.

paired brackets on the east end of the building to create a similar appearance on this end of the cornice.

The guidelines recommend retaining any character defining features of the original cornice, including brackets (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Cornices, Overhangs, and Parapets, Inappropriate Treatment 1, Guideline 1, 100-101*). The guidelines recommend the same for shutters (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Shutters, Guideline 1, pg. 113*). **Staff recognizes that removing the bracket and installing a new shutter would create a more balanced appearance across the façade. However, staff finds it unnecessary to remove one of the paired brackets, a character-defining feature, from the east end of the cornice for consistency**. The length of the building is approximately 56' and the asymmetry of two brackets at one end versus one bracket at the other will hardly be noticeable to the passerby, especially because of the wider space between the window and the east end of the building.

The new shutter will match the existing shutters on the façade in materials, hardware, dimensions, and design meeting the ABOT Guidelines (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Shutters, Guideline 3, 113*). Currently, each window in the façade (except one side of the referenced window) has louvered wood shutters hanging on original hardware and held open with shutter dogs.

4. Replace Front Door

The applicant proposes to replace the western front door with a solid hardwood door. The proposed door will have one pane of glass above two panels. The existing door has been altered by replacing wood panels with glass and replacing trim on the interior side of the door. The original design of the door, however, still exists. It had two narrow vertical arched panels atop two smaller rectangular panels. It is possible that the two arched panels were originally glazed. This style of door is typical of the late-nineteenth century and is contemporary with the main block addition. The use of partially glazed doors increased during the Victorian period due to the increased affordability of glass. The use of arches (as well as brackets) became popular with the Italianate style of the late nineteenth century (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Doors, Photo Captions, pg. 104*). The second front door is also contemporaneous with the late nineteenth century and has one large glass panel above three small square panels and two horizontal rectangular panels (Photo 1).

The ABOT Guidelines recommend that existing doors should be retained and repaired if possible. If repair is impossible, then the Guidelines recommend replacing the door with a new or salvaged door of the same size, design, material, and type as the original or sympathetic to the buildings style, including the number and orientation of panels and location and size of any glass. The guidelines also recommend against using generic or stock replacement doors with details that provide a false sense of historical accuracy (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Doors, Inappropriate Treatment 2, Guidelines 1 and 2, pg. 102*). Although solid wood, the proposed replacement door does not convey a period of construction as both existing doors do. The existing door is

also in good condition and could be returned to a more original state by installing wood in the bottom panels and repairing the interior trim. **Therefore, the proposed door does not meet the ABOT Guidelines. Repairing the existing door or replacing it in kind would meet the Guidelines**.

The guidelines also recommend repairing transoms and surrounding wood trim (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Doors, Guideline 1, pg. 102*). **The applicant has stated that the trim will be replaced in kind. Also, a sloped hardwood sill will be installed and the transom will be removed, repaired, and reinstalled. This proposed work meets the Guidelines.**

5. -7. Window Replacement, Enlargement, Door to Window Conversion

The applicant proposes to remove a single 6/6 double hung window from the second story of the south end of the rear elevation and replace it with a triple window. The windows will be directly above the proposed triple French doors discussed below. This window will be in the master bedroom. The windows will be 6/6, double hung, simulated divided light, wood windows manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe and will match the dimensions of the existing single window. The window trim will be 5/4" by 3 ½" wood trim with a 2" thick, sloped wood sill. All trim and windows will be painted.

The ABOT Guidelines state that windows that contribute to the overall historic character of the building should be retained. The Guidelines also recommend avoiding cutting new window openings. In new construction, the rhythm and placement of windows should be compatible with buildings in the district. The same is true of changes to an existing historic house. If window replacement is proposed, then window sashes and frames should be in kind or meet the Guidelines for Windows. Reusing original windows, particularly consolidating them in the primary façade, is also recommended (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Windows, Inappropriate Treatment 6, pg. 109; Guidelines 1, 7, and 10, pgs. 110-11; Guidelines for New Construction: Doors, Windows, and Shutters, Guideline 2, pg. 73*).

Staff notes that triple windows are not typical of mid-nineteenth century vernacular construction and that a paired window would be more appropriate to the period. Otherwise, the proposed windows and frames meet the Guidelines for replacement windows since the design and dimension of the original sash, pane configuration, detailing, and materials are similar. These windows will be located to the rear of the building, out of view from the public way. Staff also suggests that the removed second story window be used elsewhere in the house. One suggestion would be to incorporate it into the proposed triple (or paired) window.

The kitchen window in the rear elevation is also proposed for replacement. It is currently a clad casement window. The new window will be an 8/8 double hung window similar to the proposed Kolbe and Kolbe windows. The surround will be 5/4" x 4" wood trim with a 1 ¾" wood sill. **This kitchen window replacement also meets the ABOT Guidelines for windows.**

Two doors are proposed for replacement with windows. A modern door in the west end of the rear elevation will become a 2/2 double hung wood window. It will be next to the proposed French doors discussed in the following section. A modern metal door with a simple glass transom in the side (west) elevation will also become a 2/2 wood window. The windows will match the existing windows in the late-nineteenth century addition. These 2/2 windows have a flat, 1 1/8" wide muntins. The proposed simulated divided light windows will have 1 1/4" wide muntins. The trim will be wood and match existing window trim profiles. The window heights, widths, and alignments will also match the respective elevations. **The new 2/2 window sashes and surrounds meet the Guidelines for windows.**

Converting doors to windows is similar to cutting new window openings, which the Guidelines recommend avoiding. However, as with the rear windows on the south end of the main block, the proposed work will occur on the rear and side elevations of the building, not the façade. Additionally, the proposed windows will replace modern doors with matching 2/2 windows that will not visually detract from these elevations. A brick, two-step, stoop beneath the northern door will also be removed. This stoop does not exhibit outstanding workmanship and is in need of repair. Staff finds that its removal will not detract from the character of the main block.

8. Replace French Doors and Install New French Doors in South Elevation

The applicant proposes to remove narrow (24" wide) metal clad French doors on the rear elevation and leading into the kitchen. Three new wood French doors that are 8' tall and approximately 30" wide will replace these doors to allow a better view of the back yard from the kitchen. They will have simulated divided lights with 7/8" muntins as manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe. The height of the doors will better align with the existing first floor kitchen window.

The applicant also proposes to create a new door in the north end of the rear elevation and install new wood French doors to provide easier access between the house (mud room) and backyard shed. The doors will be similar to those being installed in the kitchen.

As with windows, cutting new door openings should be avoided according to the ABOT Guidelines. The Guidelines state that in new construction, the rhythm and placement of doors should be compatible with buildings in the district. The same is true of changes to an existing historic house. **Staff notes that triple French doors are not typical of mid-nineteenth century vernacular construction and that a double door into the kitchen would be more appropriate to the period. Otherwise, the wood doors, muntins widths, and simulated divided lights are in keeping with the ABOT Guidelines. They are also an improvement over the existing modern doors. Meanwhile, the late twentieth century character of the French door will not imply a false sense of history. The heights and widths are related to the existing and proposed windows in the rear elevation.** The proposed French doors will be in the rear of the house, out of view from the public way, and no original doors will be replaced (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Doors, Inappropriate Treatment*

2, Guideline 2, pg. 102, and Windows, Inappropriate Treatment 6, Guideline 2, pg. 109; Guidelines for New Construction: Doors, Windows, and Shutters, Guideline 2, pg. 73).

9. Replace Gutters and Downspouts

The gutters and downspouts on the main block will be replaced with similar K-shaped gutters with a white baked enamel coating**. This more elaborate gutter shape is consistent with the Victorian details of the main block, meeting the ABOT Guidelines. White is a color that is compatible with the white trim of the main block** (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Gutters and Downspouts, Guidelines 3 and 5, pg. 99*).

10. Iron Porch Railing

The applicant proposes to install iron railing on the east end of the front porch to meet building code. The porch at this end is approximately 45" above the ground. In Bluemont and Loudoun County's other historic districts, metal is not typically used for porch railing. **Therefore, the Guidelines recommend against introducing metalwork for details, such as railings, where there is no historic documentation of their use** (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Materials: Metal, Text; Inappropriate Treatments 2, p. 132*). The historic precedent for Victorian era porches is turned or scroll-sawn balustrades. This type of balustrade would show a clear architectural relationship to the historic building and would meet the ABOT Guidelines (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Porticos, Front and Rear Porches, Photo Caption pg. 114; Guideline 4, pg. 115*).

11.-13. Rear Porch Repairs and Improvements

An existing deck on the south side of the rear of the house and outside the kitchen is in need of repair. Water damaged floor boards needing replacement will be replaced in kind with pressure treated wood. The existing railing does not meet current building code requirements and will be replaced with pressure treated wood balustrade with the following dimensions: 4"x4" posts with a 5/4"x4" top rail, 2"x4" supporting rail, 2"x4" bottom rail, and 2"x2" balusters. The diamond lattice beneath the porch will be replaced with square pressure treated wood lattice. The fascia will be replaced with a 1"x10" board. All new wood except for deck flooring will be painted white.

The work proposed for the existing deck is appropriate and meets the ABOT Guidelines. Replacing materials in kind (wood deck boards) is the recommended treatment. The materials and the simple style of the new wood balustrade proposed for the modern deck is appropriate to the district, as is the square lattice. Painting wood is also recommended in the Guidelines (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Porticos, Front and Rear Porches, Guideline 4, pg. 115; Guidelines for Materials, Wood, Guidelines 4 and 6, pg 122*). Staff notes that this rear deck is not visible from the street.

An entry porch on the north side of the rear elevation will be extended to run the full width of the building between the corner of the main block and the log addition. It will measure approximately 15' long by 4' wide. Currently, it is a small (6' by 4') porch in

front of the existing door (to be replaced by a window). The porch floor and balustrade will match that proposed for the main deck off the kitchen.

The ABOT Guidelines state that new porches should reflect the size, materials, proportions, and placement of historic porches in the rural areas (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for New Construction: Front and Rear Porches, Guidelines 2 and 3, pg. 75*). **The proposed extension of the rear entry porch meets these Guidelines.** It will be a narrow porch providing an entrance into the mudroom from the backyard shed. The painted wood balustrade and 1" by 8" fascia is appropriate for this basic porch type. Also, the balustrade matches that proposed for the deck. The entry porch is located to the rear of the house, a typical location for porches in Bluemont. Furthermore, it will not be visible from the street.

Nonetheless, staff notes that the ABOT Guidelines do not encourage decks in historic districts and identify them as "Inappropriate Treatments" (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Porticos, Front and Rear Porches, Inappropriate Treatment 6, pg. 114*). Should the applicant consider major changes to the rear deck or the entry porch in the future, then a porch with a roof or a stone patio meeting the ABOT Guidelines are more appropriate solutions for outdoor living space.

Log Addition
A shorter two-story log addition with a standing seam metal roof and a stone foundation projects from the rear of the main block. The log addition has existed in its location for over a century and achieved significance as part of the historical evolution of the building. Therefore, the proposed changes to this addition are reviewed with the goal of meeting the same level of preservation as the main block.

1. *Remove Board and Batten Siding*

The applicant proposes to remove the board and batten siding on the south and east elevations of the log addition. The logs are exposed on the west elevation. The applicant states that the board and batten was added by a previous owner in the 1970s. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, people clad log houses with wood siding, often clapboard but also board and batten, stucco, or brick, to protect the logs from deterioration by the weather.[3] Removing historic siding to expose logs is a late twentieth century phenomenon and is not appropriate for log houses.

The Guidelines state that wood should be one of the dominant cladding and decorative materials for district residences (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Materials: Wood, Guideline 4, pg. 122*). Since the log addition would have traditionally been clad with siding, removing the existing siding does not meet this guideline. However, the applicant states that the existing siding was added in the 1970s and is not original. The existing board and batten siding is also rough cut and very utilitarian. When compared with the main block, there is no visual or architectural connection between it and the log addition.

[3] Bomberger, Bruce. D (1991) Preservation Brief 26: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Log Buildings. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources. pg. 2

Therefore, staff finds that removing the board and batten siding from this rear addition that is not visible from the road would be appropriate in this case.

Staff also notes that the logs may have been sided in the 1970s to stop deterioration already underway. If this is the case, then maintaining, and possibly painting, the existing siding or replacing the board and batten siding with clapboards are solutions that would be appropriate and help visually connect the log addition to the main block. Maintaining or re-siding the log addition would also be the more historically appropriate solution.

2. Re-Chink Logs

Re-chinking the logs is proposed since the chink is cracked and most of it has been removed from the interior of the addition. A synthetic flexible chink similar to the original chink color and texture is proposed.

The Guidelines for Materials state that materials, formulas, and finishes for replacement chink should match the existing in strength, color, texture, and other visual and physical characteristics. They also state that substitute materials may be used in historic districts only if the material replicates the original in appearance (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Materials: Wood, Guideline 2, pg. 122; Substitute Materials, Guideline 1, pg. 135*). Synthetic flexible chink is a new material that has not yet been proposed for use in a County historic district. **Staff requests that the applicant bring a sample of the proposed substitute chink and the existing chink for the HDRC to review. The synthetic chink will meet the Guidelines if it similar to the original chink in strength, color, texture, and other visual and physical characteristics.**

3. Replace Roof Framing and Roof

The roof framing and standing seam metal roof will be replaced in kind as necessary. Follansbee is the roof manufacturer. The color will be patina. As noted previously, the standing seam metal roof should be similar in dimensions to traditional standing seam metal roofs made of 17" wide panels with 1½" high sides (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Roof Forms and Materials, text, pg. 92*). **Roof panels manufactured Follansbee that approximately meet these dimensions (17" wide with 1" high sides) are proposed and meet the Guidelines.**

4. Replace Existing Windows and Frames

The Statement of Justification (SOJ) states that the windows in the log addition "do not appear to be original to the building and were poorly installed…with no jamb frames securing them to the structure." The applicant proposes to retain the existing windows if they "can realistically be reconditioned." If not, then the applicant proposes to replace the existing window frames and window sashes in the log addition with 6/6, simulated divided light, double hung, wood windows matching the dimensions of the existing windows and manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe. Frames will also match the original.

Repairing, rather than replacing, window frames and sashes is the preferred treatment for historic windows. In order to determine whether the sashes and

frames should be replaced, staff notes that a window survey is required. The survey includes noting, among other things, the materials, type, hardware, and condition of the frame, sash, and panes. Photographs showing the condition of all windows must be submitted with the CAPP application (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Windows, Note, pg. 105; Guidelines 1, 3, 5, and 6, pg. 110*). Staff also recommends consulting Preservation Brief #9: The Repair of Historic Wood Windows and the Guidelines for Windows (pg. 105-111) for more guidance on survey and repair.

Only if windows are deemed irreparable should they be replaced in kind. Staff finds that the proposed replacement windows meet the Guidelines for new windows.

5. Create New Windows and Hang Shutters

New windows and shutters are proposed for the east (side) and south (rear) elevations of log addition. Two windows will be cut into in the west end of the east elevation, matching existing windows in the first and second stories of this elevation and creating a mirror image of the west elevation. Three windows are proposed for installation in the first story of the south (rear) elevation. They consist of a square, 12 light, fixed window flanked by 6/6 windows matching the existing windows in the addition.

As with proposed window and door changes to the main block, the ABOT Guidelines recommend the avoidance of cutting new openings in a historic building. The proposed new windows for the log addition will be on side and rear elevations that are not visible from the road. The proposed replacement windows and frames will match the existing windows and manufactured by Kolbe and Kolbe as with all proposed replacement windows. As noted earlier, the 6/6, simulated divided light, double hung, wood windows meet the ABOT Guidelines.

The windows proposed for the side elevation of the log addition will create a balance in the south elevation that is appropriate to, and may improve, the visual appearance of this side of the building. Therefore, staff finds that these new windows are an acceptable change to the log addition.

The windows proposed for the rear elevation of the log addition are in a configuration not typically found in historic buildings, particularly log structures. The use of three windows does not follow the common fenestration pattern of two windows or two windows flanking a central door. Furthermore, the central fixed pane window is comparable to a picture window. **Picture windows are indentified as an Inappropriate Treatment in the Guidelines** (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Windows, Inappropriate Treatments, pg. 109*). Instead, two windows or two paired windows would be a more appropriate fenestration pattern. Another option would be to reuse the window frames and/or sashes salvaged from the rear frame addition should demolition be approved. These windows consist of paired 6/6 double hung windows and an 8/8 double hung window (Photos 1 and 2). These windows could be arranged in the same fenestration pattern proposed by the applicant. **Reusing windows would meet the Guidelines and would help to mitigate adding new**

openings to the log addition and the demolition of the rear frame addition (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Windows, Guideline 10, pg. 111*).

The shutters for the new windows will be wood, louvered, match the size of the opening, hang on hinges, and held back with shutter dogs as recommended in the Guidelines. The applicant may also replace the existing vinyl shutters on the log addition with wood shutters if the budget permits. This proposal also meets the Guidelines (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Shutters, Guideline 3, 113*).

6. Infill Second Story Door

A door in the rear of second story will be infilled with new logs or the existing door will be retained and repaired. The Guidelines recommend retaining and repairing character-defining features as the preferred treatment. It appears that newer tongue and groove boards and not a door currently infill the opening. **Staff finds that infilling the opening with new logs or retaining the opening are appropriate treatments.** If the opening is maintained and the HDRC approves demolition of the frame addition, then staff suggests that the applicant explore whether the panel door in the frame addition fits the opening and could be used as infill.

Photo 1: East elevation of frame addition proposed for demolition showing paired 6/6 windows.

Photo 2: West elevation of frame addition proposed for demolition showing 8/8 windows and paneled door.

7. Install French Door

The applicant proposed to expand an existing double door and install a 72” by 80” French door in the east (side) elevation. The existing door is comprised of two narrow tongue and groove doors with one window. They do not appear to be original to the building. The replacement door will be the same as those proposed for the rear of the house. **Since the door is to the rear of the house and will match other new doors in style, material, and design, staff finds the proposed replacement appropriate.**

8. Install Wood Fascia

Upon removing the board and batten siding, the applicant plans to install 1" x 6" wood fascia boards and wood soffits in the eaves. **A simple painted wood fascia and enclosing the eaves with a painted soffit is appropriate for the vernacular log addition.** The Guidelines state that original eaves that define the architectural character of the building should be retained. It is also recommended that soffits be ventilated to protect against moisture build up (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Cornices, Overhangs, and Parapets, Guidelines 1 and 5, pg. 101*).

9. Install and Replace Gutters and Downspouts

Currently, the log addition does not have complete gutters or downspouts resulting in water damage to some logs. The applicant proposes to install galvanized 6" diameter half-round gutters and 3" diameter round downspouts in some locations and replace the existing in others. **The simple gutter shape and galvanized metal are consistent with the vernacular log addition, meeting the ABOT Guidelines** (*ABOT Guidelines, Guidelines for Existing Structures: Gutters and Downspouts, Guidelines 3 and 5, pg. 99*).

Frame Addition

A frame, gable roof, one room addition clad with board and batten projects from the rear of the log addition. It has a standing seam metal roof and a dry laid stone foundation. An interior brick chimney served as the flue for a stove and no interior fireplace exists. The interior is finished with plaster and lathe and a wood floor. The SOJ states that the circa 1900 addition was not in use in the 1930s. The addition is in poor repair. The foundation is dilapidated and the sill is rotten (see Photos 1 and 2, Photos 3 and 4). Inside, plaster is crumbling from the walls and the floor caving in (Photos 5-6). The applicant proposes to demolish this addition because of its condition and to expose more of the log addition.

In general, the significance of the building, in this case the frame addition, and its contribution to the district is considered when determining the appropriateness of demolition. **The frame addition has existed in its location for over a century and achieved significance as part of the historical evolution of the building.** Furthermore, the addition may have been moved from the neighboring property and served as either the mid-nineteenth century office of Dr. Henry Plaster or the home and shoemaking shop of James Murph[e]y. **As such, the building may represent one of few remaining mid-nineteenth century commercial enterprises of Bluemont** (*ABOT Guidelines: Guidelines for Demolition and Moving – Demolition Criteria a. b, d, pg. 148*).

Photo 3: South elevation of frame addition proposed for demolition.

Photo 4: D
floorboards

Photo 6: View of rear frame addition from side yard, near Snickersville Turnpike.

Photo 5: Interior view of chimney leading to stove pipe and example of broken plaster.

However, the frame addition is in very poor condition and it would take considerable effort and resources to stabilize and rehabilitate it. It is also located to the rear of the Osburn-Scott House and out of direct view from the public way (Photo 8). The addition is of simple construction and could easily be recreated. Removing it would not damage the log addition to which it is attached. Relocating the building would not be possible due to its condition (*ABOT Guidelines: Guidelines for Demolition and Moving – Demolition Criteria c., f., h., i., and k., pg. 148*).

If the HDRC approves the demolition of the frame addition, then the Guidelines recommend that the building should be thoroughly documented through photographs, and measured drawings. The documentation should be filed with the Loudoun County Department of Planning and the Virginia Department of Historic

Resources (*ABOT Guidelines: Guidelines for Demolition and Moving, Guideline 2, pg. 148*). **Staff also recommends that the window sashes, and possibly the frames, be salvaged, repaired, and used in the log addition for the three windows proposed along the rear elevation. The applicant should document through a window survey as required in the ABOT Guidelines to determine if these windows are not repairable.** Staff refers the applicant to the Windows section (pg. 105-11) of the ABOT Guidelines and Preservation Brief #9: The Repair of Historic Wood Windows for more guidance on survey and repair.

Findings

1. *The following materials proposed for rehabilitation of and alterations to the Hughes residence meet the ABOT Guidelines: standing seam metal roof, wood shutters and hardware, wood simulated divided light windows and French doors, wood porch flooring, balustrades, and square lattice, wood fascia and soffits, and metal gutters and downspouts.*
2. *The patina colored roof is a highly reflective material and meets the sustainability guidelines.*
3. *The design, materials, and scale proposed for the shed dormer meet the ABOT Guidelines. It will be on the rear of the house and not visible from the public way.*
4. *The location of the door and windows alterations and replacements are to the mainly to rear of the building, not the façade, and not visible from the public way.*
5. *Paired windows and French doors are more appropriate than triple windows and doors to the mid-nineteenth construction date of the main block.*
6. *Alterations and new windows and doors (except triple windows and doors) proposed for modern windows and doors meet the Guidelines. However, repairing, rather than replacing, windows is the preferred treatment for historic wood windows.*
7. *Removing one (western) bracket to create room for a shutter will visually balance the façade. Removing the second (eastern) bracket is not necessary for this balance.*
8. *The existing front door is repairable and contemporaneous with the late-nineteenth century addition. The proposed wood door is of a generic design that does not convey the period or style of the addition.*
9. *Iron balustrades are not typical of the Bluemont Historic District and do not meet the Guidelines.*
10. *The materials, design, and location of the rear entry porch extension and deck and entry porch repairs meet the Guidelines. If major alterations are considered for the deck in the future, then staff notes that the Guidelines do not support decks in historic districts.*

11. *Removing historic siding from log buildings is not supported by the Guidelines. The board and batten siding on the log addition is not historic; therefore, its removal is not contradictory to the recommendations.*
12. *The fenestration configuration and fixed picture window proposed for the rear elevation of the log addition do not meet the Guidelines.*

Findings for Demolition

1. The frame addition is more than a century old and may be associated with the mid-nineteenth century commercial enterprises of Bluemont. Therefore, the addition is a significant part of the Osburn-Scott House and contributes to the character of the Bluemont Historic District.
2. The frame addition is in poor condition due to a rotten sill and dilapidated foundation. Due to its condition, relocating the building may not be possible without causing its collapse.
3. The addition is on the rear of the house and out of direct view from the public way.
4. It would be possible to recreate this simply constructed addition.
5. Removing the addition would not be detrimental to the log addition to which it is attached.

Conditions

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. Existing historic windows (sashes and/or frames) removed due to alterations or demolition or proposed for replacement should be surveyed and reused as possible in new window openings proposed for the residence. These windows include 6/6 in the rear dormer, 6/6 in the rear second story, paired 6/6 and 8/8 in the frame addition, and 6/6 windows in the log addition.
2. The eastern bracket proposed for removal should be retained.
3. The front door should be repaired (replace glass with wood panels and correct interior molding) or replaced with a wood door of the same or very similar design (arched panels).
4. Paired windows and French doors should be used in place of the proposed triple windows and doors.
5. The balustrade for the front porch should be wood and show a clear relationship to style of the building by using a turned or scroll-sawn balustrade.
6. The proposed synthetic chink should match the existing strength, color, texture, and other visual and physical characteristics of historic chink recipes.
7. The fenestration for the rear elevation of the log addition should reflect historic configurations. A fixed, 12 pane picture window should not be used. The

applicant should consider incorporating the windows removed from the frame addition (should demolition be approved) in this elevation.

8. The applicant should consider reusing the panel door currently located in the frame addition in the second story log addition should the frame addition demolition be approved.

Conditions for Demolition

1. The building should be documented through photographs and measured drawings. The documentation should be filed with the Loudoun County Planning Department and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
2. The windows and doors should be surveyed and repaired if possible. Every attempt to reuse these elements in the log addition or main block should be made.

Suggested Motions

1. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2009-0013 for the changes to the main block and log addition* ***and the demolition of the rear frame addition*** *at 33697 Snickersville Turnpike in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Aldie, Bluemont, Oatlands, and Taylorstown Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the following findings (see findings above)….and the following conditions….*
2. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2009-0013 for the changes to the main block and log addition at 33697 Snickersville Turnpike in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Aldie, Bluemont, Oatlands, and Taylorstown Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the following findings…(see findings above)...and the following conditions…...*
3. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee approve Certificate of Appropriateness 2009-0013 for the changes to the main block and log addition* ***and the demolition of the rear frame addition*** *at 33697 Snickersville Turnpike in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Aldie, Bluemont, Oatlands, and Taylorstown Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the following findings (see findings above)….*
4. *I move that the Historic District Review Committee defer Certificate of Appropriateness 2009-0013 for the changes to the main block and log addition* ***and the demolition of the rear frame addition*** *at 33697 Snickersville Turnpike in accordance with the Loudoun County Historic District Guidelines for the Aldie, Bluemont, Oatlands, and Taylorstown Historic and Cultural Conservation District based on the following findings (see findings above)….and the following conditions….*
5. *I move alternate motion…*